

Appl. No. 09/183,380
Amdt. dated March 2, 2004
Reply to Official Action dated January 16, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-4, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Fellows* (U.S. Patent 4,309,664).

Claims 1-7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Cai et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,550,908 hereinafter, "*Cai*").

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cai* in view of *Brady* (U.S. Patent 6,122,353).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cai* in view of *Fellows*.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include additional features of the signal energy detecting arrangement. Such changes are supported by the Specification and contain no new matter.

New claims 11-19 have been added. These claims are supported by the Specification and contain no new matter. In that the fee for the number of independent claims and total number of claims had been paid for at the time of filing, Applicants' believe that no additional claim fees are due for the one additional independent claim and 8 dependent claims.

The drawings have been amended per Examiner's suggestions and are included in this response.

The §102 Rejections

Claims 1-10 by Fellows

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 rejections and believe the claims, as amended are allowable over the cited reference. The additional features of signal detecting arrangement are not disclosed by *Fellows*. For example, in Applicants' claimed invention, the comparators (FIG. 1, 20, 26) are not present the configuration of *Fellows*. Unlike *Fellows* for example, comparator 20 provides "for comparing a signal IN on the subscriber line at terminal 21 with an amplitude reference signal AREF at terminal 22. If the signal IN exceeds the reference signal AREF, at an output 23 of the comparator 20, a

Appl. No. 09/183,380
Amdt. dated March 2, 2004
Reply to Official Action dated January 16, 2004

signal state transition occurs (Specification, page 3, lines 30-25)" Furthermore, the integrator 24 may be set to integrate the output of the first comparator "over a predetermined interval T."

In that claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by *Fellows*, dependent claims 2-9 are not anticipated as well. Therefore, Applicants request that the §102 rejection under *Fellows* be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, and 10 by Cai

Cai is directed to techniques that "are disclosed off providing interoperability between a first modem and a calling identity delivery on call waiting (CIDCW) service. (Abstract)." The particular features outlined *supra* in Applicants' amended claims are not discussed by *Cai*. Consequently, *Cai* does not anticipate Applicants' claims. In that claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by *Cai*, dependent claims 2-9 are not anticipated as well. Therefore, Applicants request that the 102 rejection under *Cai* be withdrawn.

The §103 Rejections

Claim 8

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections. With respect to *Cai*, the Office Action concedes that *Cai* does not explicitly disclose the claimed feature of initiation pulse control switching of an impedance parallel to the subscriber line. Unlike Applicants' claimed features, *Brady* is directed to "a method and apparatus for verifying that a CAS (Customer Premises Equipment Alerting Signal) detect signal, which indicates the presence of a CAS on a transmission channel, is a valid detect signal, includes structure and process steps for suppressing a signal originating at a local telephone in response to the CAS detect signal (Abstract) .

A proper §103 rejection has not been made in that *Cai* does not teach or suggest that it be combined with *Brady*. Furthermore, *Brady* does not suggest or teach Applicants' claimed features, as outlined *supra*.

Appl. No. 09/183,380
Amdt. dated March 2, 2004
Reply to Official Action dated January 16, 2004

Claim 9

With respect to *Cai*, the Office Action concedes that *Cai* does not explicitly disclose the feature of energy determination is used for monitoring subscriber line load variations. In that *Fellows* does not teach or suggest Applicants' claim features in the discussion *supra*, the alone or in combination, *Cai* and *Fellows* does not make Applicants' claimed features obvious. Consequently, a showing of obviousness under §103 has not been made. Applicants' request the the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims 11-19

For the reasons cited *supra*, Applicants believe that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious these claims. Therefore, these claims are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants believe they have addressed the Examiner's concerns. The claims as presented are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 02-MAR-2004

By Peter Zawilski
Peter Zawilski
Registration No. 43,305
(408) 474-9063

Correspondence Address:

Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics North America Corporation
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131 USA

CUSTOMER NO: 24738